

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/730,015	12/09/2003	Rolf Honegger	068754-0292	068754-0292 2778	
22428 75	590 11/07/2005	,	EXAMINER		
10231111	LARDNER LLP		HALPERN	i, MARK	
SUITE 500 3000 K STREE	TNW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO			1731		

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/730,015	HONEGGER ET AL	HONEGGER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Mark Halpern	1731			

	Mark Halpern	1731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 September 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7.	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO		30440
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beta			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		Il be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10,12 and 26.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>13-25</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	vercome all rejections under appear	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		` ' '	,
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 			nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
13. Other:		M. Halx	W.
		Mark Halpern Primary Examiner	

Art Unit: 1731

工業

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Lewecke discloses shelving for sheets of different types, including glass sheets. The system includes shelving for storage of remainders, which are stored in vertical compartments for vertical storage of sheets and of a material sheet vehicle with a sheet reception for vertical in-and-out storage and for vertical or horizontal or tilted transportation of sheets to and from processing installation. The system includes extracting the sheets from the storage, cutting the sheets, loading the sheets on the sheet vehicle for transport to processing installation, and placing the remainders back into the storage. The cutting of sheets takes place while the sheets are supported by the storage or while the sheets are out of the storage. The storing of sheets in and out takes place in a computer-controlled manner in a predetermined sequence. Lewecke does not disclose the glass plate sheet being scribed before dividing the sheet. Lisec discloses a process for dividing glass wherein the glass is scribed by multiple notches: such as X-notches, Y-notches, W-notches, the notches extending in different directions, before dividing the sheet. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Lewecke and Lisec, because such a combination would provide for maximum utilization of glass sheet utilizing minimum of space in the process of Lewecke. Upon delivery of the sheets the glass sheets are mechanically re-positioned, as required in the process. A glass may also be withdrawn from the storage and delivered to the processing stage without dividing the glass into portions. It would have been obvious that the steps are repeated as required and that the processing is performed in a predetermined sequence.